

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. Support for the drawing amendment can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 5 lines 7-27.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of June 10, 2008, claims 1-13 are rejected. Additionally, claim 10 is objected to. In response, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10 and 11 have been amended and claim 2 has been canceled. Additionally, Figure 1 has been amended. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Amendments to the Drawings

Figure 1 has been amended. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 5 lines 7-27.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to as allegedly being grammatically incorrect. In response, claim 10 has been amended to add the phrase "in the" in front of the word "electronics." As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, claim 7 has been amended to replace the phrase "and/or" with "or." As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 112 rejections of claims 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Stolan (U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,663). Claims 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stolan in view of Ubicom (Ubicom Product Report –IP2002 Internet Processor, hereafter "Ubicom"). Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stolan in view of Kamiya et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,887, hereafter "Kamiya"). Applicant respectfully

submits that the pending claims are patentable over Stolan, Ubicom, and Kamiya for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 2. Additionally, claim 1 has been further amended to particularly point out that early triggering is permitted in the special mode of operation, and early triggering is not permitted in the normal mode of operation. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 4 lines 1-6. As amended, claim 1 recites:

“A method of monitoring the operation of at least one microcontroller unit that is intended for at least one application and is associated with a system, by means of at least one base chip, particularly a system base chip, characterized in that:

a reset of the microcontroller unit is caused if at least one special sequence, particularly at least one drive or access sequence assigned to the reset operation, is applied to the base chip; and

a special mode of operation, particularly a flash mode of the base chip, can be activated once after the special sequence and after the reset operation, by allowing access to at least one monitoring module that is associated with the base chip to take place in a manner which is simplified in comparison with the normal mode of operation of the microcontroller unit, wherein early triggering is permitted in the special mode of operation, and early triggering is not permitted in the normal mode of operation.” (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that Stolan does not disclose that “early triggering is permitted in the special mode of operation, and early triggering is not permitted in the normal mode of operation,” as recited in amended claim 1. Stolan discloses a normal mode and a programming mode of a watch dog timer circuit (10), as described in column 1, lines 11-16, column 2, lines 41-45, the paragraph beginning at column 2, line 66, and column 5, lines 5-16. However, Stolan does not disclose that early triggering is permitted in the programming mode of the watch dog timer circuit (10), and that early triggering is not permitted in the normal mode of the watch dog timer circuit (10). Because Stolan does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Stolan.

Dependent Claims 2-4 and 10-11

Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the

independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Independent Claim 5

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitation of “*at least one monitoring module that is associated with the microcontroller unit*” of claim 6. Additionally, claim 5 has been amended to particularly point out that “*a special mode of operation, particularly a flash mode of the base chip, can be activated once after the special sequence and after the reset operation, by allowing access to the at least one monitoring module to take place in a manner which is simplified in comparison with the normal mode of operation of the microcontroller unit, wherein early triggering is permitted in the special mode of operation, and early triggering is not permitted in the normal mode of operation.*”

Support for the amendment can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 4 lines 1-6. As amended, claim 5 includes similar limitations to amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above remarks with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 5 is not anticipated by Stolan.

Dependent Claims 6-9 and 12-13

Claim 6 has been amended to remove the limitation of “*at least one monitoring module that is associated with the microcontroller unit.*” Claims 6-9 and 12-13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 5. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 6-9 and 12-13 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 5.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-9 of copending Application No. 10/517,471 in view of Stolan, Ubicom and Kamiya. Applicant notes

herein that the alleged double patenting rejections will be addressed at a later time, assuming that these rejections are still applicable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Matthias Muth

Date: September 9, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111